



AF 92

Docket No. CRD-0918

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Donald F. DePalma et al. Confirmation No. 4482  
Serial No. : 10/041,117  
Filed : January 8, 2002  
Title : MODULAR ANEURYSM REPAIR SYSTEM  
Art Unit : 3738  
Examiner : Cheryl L. Miller

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the  
United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed  
to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

November 21, 2006

(Date of Deposit)

Carl J. Evens

(Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered Representative)

/Carl J. Evens/

(Signature)

November 21, 2006

(Date of Signature)

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR § 41.41**

Dear Sirs:

Appellants, through their attorney, in response to the Examiner's Answer dated September 22, 2006, would like to take this opportunity to reply specifically to paragraphs numbered 7 & 10 raised in the Examiner's Answer, and respectfully respond as follows:

**REMARKS**

**7. Claims Appendix**

With respect to the Examiner's remarks regarding the Claims Appendix section, Appellants respectfully submit the Examiner is correct in that Claim 20 was missing and apologize for any inconvenience as a result of the omission.

**10. Response to Argument**

With respect to Examiner's response, Applicants respectfully submit that the underlying basis for the rejection as presented by the Examiner lies in the fact that there is no limitation in the claim that indicates that the self-expanding lattice runs through substantially the whole soft material. This is clearly erroneous.

In *Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Electric U.S.A.*, 868 F.2d 1251, 9 USPQ2d 1962 (Fed Cir. 1989), the court stated, "a court may not redraft a claim for purposes of avoiding a defense of anticipation," and "extraneous limitations from the specification....[should not] be read into the claim wholly apart from any need to interpret what the patentee meant by particular *words or phrases in the claim*," "[i]t is entirely proper to use the specification to interpret what the patentee meant by a word or phrase in the claim."

In *Glaverbel Societe Anonyme v. Northlake Marketing & Supply, Inc.*, 45 F.3d 1550, 33 USPQ2d 1496 (Fed Cir. 1995), the court stated, "In determining whether a patented invention is anticipated, the claims are read in the context of the patent specification in which they arise and in which the invention is described. If needed to impart clarity or avoid ambiguity, the prosecution history and the prior art may also be consulted in order to ascertain whether the patentee's invention is novel or was previously known to the art."

Clearly the specification, including the drawings, set forth that the phrase "self-expanding lattice and graft material covering at least a portion of the self-expanding lattice"

Serial No. 10/041,117

means a stent running the length of the graft and not what Rhodes discloses or suggests. In other words, it is clear from the specification what the claims set forth.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl J. Evens/

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Carl J. Evens  
Reg. No. 33,874  
Attorney for Applicant

Johnson & Johnson  
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza  
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003  
(732) 524-2218  
Dated: November 21, 2006